



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,504	03/15/2004	Steven Christopher Austen	A01513	9494
21898	7590	02/28/2007	EXAMINER	
ROHM AND HAAS COMPANY PATENT DEPARTMENT 100 INDEPENDENCE MALL WEST PHILADELPHIA, PA 19106-2399			SANDERS, KRIELLION ANTIONETTE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1714	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		02/28/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/800,504	AUSTEN ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Kriellion A. Sanders	1714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/04, 10/05</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

**DETAILED ACTION*****Double Patenting***

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-11 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of copending Application No.

11/242,439.

3. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

4. Claims 1-11 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of copending Application No.

11/242,352.

5. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Applicant's present claim 1 is directed to a stabilizer composition comprising a dihydropyridine, a polydihydropyridine, or a mixture thereof.

Claim 2 further recites the stabilizer composition of claim 1, wherein the composition comprises an aminoalcohol and the aminoalcohol is tris(hydroxymethylamino)methane, tris(hydroxyethylamino)ethane, triethanolamine, N,N'-bis(2- hydroxyethyl)ethylenediamine, glucamine, or a mixture comprising at least one of the foregoing aminoalcohols.

Claim 3 further recites the stabilizer composition of claim 1, wherein the composition comprises a perchlorate salt and the perchlorate salt has the formula  $M(ClO_4)_n$ , wherein M is Li, Na, K, Mg, Ca, Sr, Zn, Al, La or Ce, and n is 1, 2 or 3, depending on the valence of M.

6. Claim 6 recites a method of stabilizing a composition comprising adding to a halogen-containing vinyl polymer composition the stabilizer composition of claim 1, 2, or 3.

Claim 7 is directed to a polymeric composition, comprising a halogen-containing vinyl polymer.

Claim 11 is directed to the stabilizer composition of claim 1 further comprising a polyol co-stabilizer.

Each of the copending applications encompasses the compositions of applicant's claims including dihydropyridine, a polydihydropyridine, or a mixture thereof, aminoalcohol, a polyol co-stabilizer and a halogen-containing vinyl polymer.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Wehner et al, US Patent No. 6,194,494 and 5,925,696.

9. Wehner et al disclose stabilizer compositions for PVC resins and articles formed therefrom wherein the compositions comprise perchlorate compounds, dihydropyridines, polydihydropyridines and polyols. The components of applicant's claims are clearly taught by the references. Selection of any of the components taken from the teachings of Wehner et al to formulate a stabilizing composition for halogenated resins would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 1714

ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention. See Wehner et al, '494 at the abstract, col. 2, lines 45-67, col. 6, line 50 through col. 8, line 22.

10. See Wehner et al, '696 at the abstract, col. 2, lines 32-53, col. 6, line 40 through col. 78, line 61.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kuhn et al, US Patent No. 6,013,703.

11. Kuhn et al teaches compositions for halogenated resins comprising dihydropyridine, polyhydropyridine, polyols and perchlorate salts. No patentable difference is readily ascertained between the presently claimed and patented compositions.

See col. 35, line 31 through col. 37, line 60 and claims 7 and 8.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kriellion A. Sanders whose telephone number is 571-272-1122. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8:30am-7:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on 571-272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1714

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Kriellion A. Sanders  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1714

ks